

Vaxxes, Viruses, and Taking Back Science

 Send to Kindle

The so-called “anti-vaxxers” figured out pre-COVID-19 that “safe, necessary, and effective” is a mere slogan. They came to this realization by looking under the hood of the prevailing vaccine story. A little checking into the actual facts was all it took to shatter the story. Most of what they found fell into a few categories, which are listed below. It turns out that anti-vaxxers who move on to examine the prevailing virus story will experience a déjà vu of sorts—but more on that later.

Also, later, is a discussion of a new book entitled *Can you Catch a Cold? Untold History & Human Experiments* by Daniel Roytas, which may prompt a major shift in the public’s understanding as to viruses.

Vaccines

Below is a refresher on some of what the anti-vaxxers found upon examining the vaccine story.

An untold history much different than the prevailing story

The anti-vaxxers learned that the prevailing story about vaccines bears little resemblance to the actual historic record. For example, they learned that the Leicester method was used in Leicester, England and elsewhere in the late 1800s to achieve better results against smallpox, without mass vaccination, than nearby towns with high vaccination rates. They also learned that there was a dramatic overall decline in deaths purportedly caused by infectious agents prior to the use of vaccines, and that improved standards of living were largely responsible for it.

A change in the meaning of terms

The anti-vaxxers learned of a change in the meaning of terms to suit the story. For example, they learned of the re-definition of polio around the time of the release of the Salk vaccine to be more stringent, requiring longer lasting paralysis (i.e., 60 days instead of 24 hours), thereby making diagnosis less likely. They also learned of the change in the meaning of “control group” from those given only inert substances, such as saline, to those given non-inert substances, such as another vaccine.

Incomplete, illogical research

In addition to learning of the lack of use of true controls in vaccine research, the anti-vaxxers learned of other stunning aspects of that research, such as the extremely short periods of prelicensure studies and the lack of studies required by regulators comparing the health outcomes of the vaccinated vs. unvaccinated. (As an aside, recent vaccinated vs. unvaccinated research involving several thousand children and a period of about ten years found that the unvaccinated children fared better overall than the vaccinated children.)

Viruses

Now, let's move on to why anti-vaxxers may experience déjà vu when examining the prevailing virus story.

The generally believed story is that viruses exist and spread from person to person; that certain of them cause illness; and that antibodies are developed in response to viruses, which is good and protective. Of course, the public is aware of a thing or two which doesn't square with the story, such as that having antibodies to a virus is sometimes bad, as with HIV. But those who have snooped around asking questions about HIV have paid a heavy price for doing so. Just ask Celia Farber. Therefore, few do.

The “history” of viruses most hold in their heads is that viruses were “discovered” when scientists took bodily fluid from a sick person, put it under a microscope, and saw viruses swimming around in there; testing then occurred

using the scientific method, exposing subjects to those viruses in a manner similar to natural exposure; and this resulted in sickness with the same symptoms the viruses are known to cause. However, the actual history departs sharply from this fairy tale.

Below is a starter kit of information one will find when poking around the facts about viruses.

An untold history much different than the prevailing story

Contrary to the story, viruses were declared to exist by scientists before supposedly being isolated. Further, unlike bacteria and fungi, viruses have not been found directly in bodily fluids nor observed under a light microscope. They are reportedly too small for this. Instead, a convoluted, indirect, cell culture method has been the “gold standard” used to purportedly isolate viruses. Because viruses cannot be observed under a light microscope, electron microscopy has been used to purportedly visualize them, but only after the specimens have undergone complex steps involving being fixed with heavy metal salts and formaldehyde, dehydrated, embedded in resin, and stained. A scientific dispute exists regarding whether the particles identified as viruses in electron microscopy images actually constitute such. They may arguably constitute artifacts due to the preparation process, non-viral particles from materials added during the process, and/or extracellular vesicles (called exosomes) which cannot reliably be differentiated from viruses. Additionally, a multitude of studies conducted since the turn of the twentieth century involving exposing experimental subjects to alleged illness-causing viruses, sometimes using shockingly extreme methods, failed to produce illness in the subjects. Further, there is an untaught history concerning the manner in which influence from the petrochemical and pharmaceutical industries steered the field of science to focus upon the germ theory of illness over other plausible theories.

A change in the meaning of terms

Use of the terms “purify” and “isolate” within virology obfuscates the true nature of the methodology being used. The terms generally mean to *separate* something

from the rest. However, within virology, they mean something close to the inverse of that usual meaning. The cell culture process used for purification and isolation of a virus involves *adding* a multitude of substances to a cell culture, some of which have their own RNA and/or toxic effects, and the dying of the cell (cytopathic effect) purportedly constitutes proof of the presence and pathogenicity of a virus.

Incomplete, illogical research

The field of virology is replete with studies which make little sense. For example, studies which purportedly demonstrate the existence of viruses and/or their pathogenicity have used highly unnatural methods of exposure to the alleged virus under study (e.g., polio research involving drilling holes into the heads of animals and directly injecting fluid containing a putrid substance—diseased spinal cord tissue—into their skulls; SARS-CoV-2 research involving pouring a relatively large volume of liquid down the noses and throats of animals, in a waterboarding-like fashion). Other such studies have found symptoms in the experimental subjects which differ from those said to be caused by the virus under study (e.g., slight bristled fur and weight loss observed in mice in SARS-CoV-2 research). Additionally, virological studies often fail to provide proof of the use of true controls (i.e., to show that a group of specimens without the alleged virus was subjected to the exact same conditions, including to the exact same addition of any agents, as the experimental specimens purportedly containing the virus).

Fortunately, as discussed below, there is a group clamoring for strict adherence to the scientific method in the field of virology.

A new book, and a group calling for the use of true controls in virology, may transform the virus story.

Can you Catch a Cold? Untold History & Human Experiments by Daniel Roytas touches upon many of the issues discussed above in greater depth. It also delves into the little-discussed area of other potential causes, aside from pathogenic agents, for multiple people in the same locality to become ill at once—such as

weather and atmospheric changes. It's a blend of history, research findings, and thought-provoking questions and will likely be a game changer for the virus narrative in the manner *Dissolving Illusions: Disease, Vaccines, and The Forgotten History* was for the vaccine narrative.

Roytas, Dr. Mark Bailey, Dr. Sam Bailey, and Mike Stone, are some of the leading voices of what's referred to as the "no virus" perspective. Despite the anti-science slurs they've suffered, they *strenuously call for* use of the scientific method in virus research and urge scrutiny of the methods section of all studies to determine whether true controls were used. They make reasonable arguments that, due to a lack of adherence to the scientific method, virology has failed to prove its case that viruses exist and cause illness.

Hopefully, at the urging of the "no virus" camp, we can take science back from those who have led it woefully astray from the scientific method.